her in her life time on a promissory Note for $365 for which he says he in reply to interrogatories propounded to him by your Orator value. The claims of Peck and Miles who came in by petition and are fully established,

There can be no well founded objection to Renwick's claim on the promissory Note held by him for two thousand dollars, a recent judgment upon it against Mrs Chases Executor which has affirmed on appeal and her sons obligation to him for seven hundred dollars has been duly proved and is moreover recognized in her letter to Mr Talbott, to which she urgently requests him to pay it. The objection in the answers of the defendants to those claims referred to therein that they were passed to the holders on usurious consideration has not been sustained by the Evidence. The other objection relied upon in those answers that the claims were barred by limitation has already been disposed of and the remaining objection that Mrs Chase received no value for them, which means nothing more than they were her obligations given to accommodate her grandson and enable him to raise money cannot be seriously considered, whether they were accommodation obligations or not cannot affect the rights of bona fide holders for value to recover upon them, whether matured to them before or after maturity Renwick vs Williams above cited 364 and even if they knew at the time they took them that they were of that character, such is the law certainly if they took them before maturity with such knowledge and it can scarcely be questioned that the Court of Appeals of this State would apply the same rule in cases in which the paper was taken after maturity with such knowledge, after a bind was given by the Judges delivering the opinion of the Court in the above case p 303 cases of the highest authority recognize a clear distinction between accommodation Notes or Bills, and those that are wholly without consideration or fundamental, and as such nudum pactum. Some of the cases go to the length of asserting that though the holder of a Note claiming

by virtue of an Endorsement made after the same was due, yet when he received it had it was an accommodation Note that such a fact would not defeat his right to recover against the maker" and in the same case and in reference to Mrs Chases transactions with her grandson in connection with one of these very same Notes the Court makes the general remark, The Equity of the maker cannot include such a defence as the one relied on. The special case (by that the Note was accommodation paper taken after maturity) after the defendant had given her Note to accommodate the payee by enabling him to raise money upon it and to pay debts and in furtherance of the very purpose which the maker designed the Note should accomplish when she issued it, it passes into the hands of a bona fide holder for value. Would it be Equitable and proper further to add upon these facts to what the payee of the Note p 364,

The claims filed as Complainants Exhibit 1 B No 3 C No 3 A No 25 and No 25 are judgments obtained against Mrs Chase in her lifetime in Baltimore County Court on her promissory Notes in favor of William Chase Barney Endorsed by Short copies under the hand of the Clerk of the Court, which is not pretended have been satisfied. The claims filed as Complainants Exhibits No C, J, & 1 to No 25 inclusive are also upon her promissory Notes in favor of William Chase Barney and her signatures as maker and his as endorser of these several Notes have been proved under the Commission which I think sufficiently establishes these claims against her, there being no contravening Evidence in the Record to impair their validity. The claims marked Complainants Exhibit No 1, 2 and 3 are reserved for further consideration. It appears by a statement in writing signed by William A Talbott Trustee under the deed hereinafter referred to and by a copy of the account of the Trust estate under the deed with them as limited reported by the Auditor in the case in Baltimore County Court of Patterson vs Talbott that a very large proportion